



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

SW

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/688,863	10/17/2000	Hisato Yoshii	Q61364	2476

7590

03/23/2004

SUGHRUE, MION, ZINN, MACPEAK & SEAS  
2100 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.,  
Washington, DC 20037

EXAMINER
----------

GOODMAN, CHARLES

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3724

14

DATE MAILED: 03/23/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/688,863

Applicant(s)

YOSHII, HISATO

Examiner

Charles Goodman

Art Unit

3724

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 December 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 2,4-6,9-12 and 14-19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 2, 4-6, 9-12 and 14-19 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. The Amendment filed on 12/29/03 has been entered.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

2. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
3. Claims 2, 4-6, 9-12, and 14-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Witjes in view of Neal.

Witjes discloses the invention substantially as claimed including a retaining mechanism (28). However, it appears that Witjes lacks a level adjusting mechanism for the table (3). In that regard, Neal teaches a support table (D) having a level adjusting mechanism (e.g., d, d<sup>1</sup>) that adjusts relative position between the between the support table and the rotary cutters (C, C) in the vertical direction for the purpose of maintaining a desired depth of cut for the rotary cutters depending on the thickness of the material being cut. Thus, it would have been obvious to the ordinary artisan at the time of the instant invention to provide the device of Witjes with the level adjusting mechanism as taught and suggested by Neal for the reasons stated *supra*.

***Response to Arguments***

4. Applicant's arguments filed 12/29/03 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In response to Applicant's basic argument that Witjes in view of Neal does not render the claimed invention obvious, this argument is traversed. As shown in Fig. 1 of

Art Unit: 3724

Neal, the features as reading on the support table (D, D) are mounted for adjustment in that view, i.e. the thickness view perpendicular to the axes of the saws. In the orientation shown, they support the workpiece from below. Even if this is not the case, at the very least Witjes already includes a support table supporting the workpiece from below in the same orientation as shown in Fig. 1 of Neal, and Neal has been applied to teach the obviousness of the level adjusting mechanism. Applicant's arguments to the contrary is tangential to the issue at bar.

In response to Applicant's basic argument that Witjes lacks the retaining mechanism, this argument is not well taken. The "joints" are referring to the bends in the bar (28) as opposed to manipulating joints as Applicant appears to argue. Thus, contrary to Applicant's contentions, the retaining mechanism of Witjes includes the claimed motion. Even if Witjes lacked such a feature, it is not a patentably distinct feature.

In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, the motivation stems from the combination of references. While Witjes includes adjustment of the knives themselves, adjustment of the table itself, as taught and suggested by Neal, also provides further control for properly orienting the knives as desired. Thus, contrary to

Art Unit: 3724

Applicant's assertions, the modification proposed by the Examiner will not destroy the teachings of Witjes. It will add to operability of the device.

### ***Conclusion***

5. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Charles Goodman whose telephone number is (703) 308-0501. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday between 7:30 AM to 6:00 PM EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Allan Shoap, can be reached on (703) 308-1082.


Application/Control Number: 09/688,863

Page 5

Art Unit: 3724

In lieu of mailing, it is encouraged that all formal responses be faxed to (703) 872-9306. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1148.

cg  
March 22, 2004

  
**Charles Goodman**  
**Primary Examiner**  
**AU 3724**

**CHARLES GOODMAN**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**